

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Mechanisms for addressing and managing the influence of corporations on public health policy, research and practice: a scoping review
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Mialon, Melissa; Vandevijvere, Stefanie; Carriedo-Lutzenkirchen, Angela; Bero, Lisa; Gomes, Fabio; Petticrew, Mark; McKee, Martin; Stuckler, D; Sacks, Gary

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Clare Herrick King's College London, UK
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	22-Oct-2019

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Thank you for asking me to review this paper which draws on systematic literature searches to develop 'an inventory of the mechanisms to address and manage the influence of corporations on public health policy, research and practice'. This is done across a very wide range of industries – alcohol, food, gambling, oil, pharma and tobacco – at a variety of spatial/ political scales. The result is a comprehensive list of mechanisms that exist, but may or may not have been implemented with (unknown) degrees of success. The paper delivers on what it sets out to do and provides a well-referenced and methodologically sound repository of information on these mechanisms for other researchers in the field. To this end, however, it is mostly descriptive. It does acknowledge the need for 'more research on these mechanisms' and 'an evaluation of these mechanisms', but stops short of doing so. While it is correct to claim originality for being the first paper to provide an overview of these mechanisms, I think there are some aspects of the paper that could do with further reflection and analysis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The paper explores mechanisms across six huge and diverse industries with which the public and politicians have very different relationships and whose health impacts are diverse. Pharma is definitively not the same in a public health sense as food/ alcohol/ tobacco and all raise fundamentally different questions to that of oil. While there are clear synergies in terms of corporate actors and strategies across them, to roll them into one category misses the nuance of public concern and public risk. It also fundamentally erases both the political and the social. The paper needed to better reflect on these differences, rather than just admit that its scope was broad. Breadth at the expense of explanatory or analytical depth is not always that enlightening.</li><li>2. What does it mean to have a mechanism simply exist without any sense of its path to (non)implementation? One of the great</li></ol>
-------------------------	---

	barriers to better health worldwide is not a lack of regulation, but its equitable enforcement. How might paths and experiences of implementation be researched? That's probably the bigger and more important question. Setting out mechanisms is hypothetical. The paper needed more reflection on the reality of what these mechanisms can or cannot achieve and why? Why might a mechanism work in one type of industry but not another? What does that tell us about the political/ scientific/ public relation with that industry and its products? What does it tell us about the place of implementation? Again, more nuance, reflection and critical engagement with the varied contexts of these mechanisms would make for a more analytical paper.
--	---

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Ratchakorn Kaewpramkusol Ministry of Public Health, Thailand
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	25-Oct-2019

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review your paper. The article is interesting and has the potential to make a valuable contribution. Despite its apparent strengths, there are a few areas that could have been done with more clarity. Below I offer some suggestions to further strengthen the paper.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A topic sentence at the beginning of each paragraph would help improve the flow of the paragraphs in the Introduction.</li> <li>- You did a great job of describing increasing industry efforts to influence public policy, research and practice. It would be great to provide a brief description of 'Corporate Permeation Index' (Lines 80-81). 1-2 sentences would be fine.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Page 14 Lines 343-344: Not sure what you mean here, could you elaborate on this sentence?</li> <li>- Page 15 Lines 347-348: I guess you mean that the majority of these 26 mechanisms targets academia. It would be better to rearrange the grouping of the mechanisms displayed in Table 2 to demonstrate this. It seems confusing in its current format.</li> </ul> <p>Minor edits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should it be 'Additional' or 'Supplementary' files? At least, it should be consistent throughout.</li> <li>- Page 16 Line 385: FCTC, not FTCT</li> <li>- Please include research recommendations in the Abstract section.</li> </ul>
-------------------------	---

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dhruv Khullar Weill Cornell Medicine, USA
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	11-Nov-2019

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	The goal of this study was to identify ways in which institutions can reduce the influence of corporations on public health policy in order to minimize ethical lapses and conflicts of interest. The authors searched several large databases and drew on their collective experience to identify 49 total mechanisms, 41 of which have been implemented in some capacity. This review tackles an important issue. the growing influence of corporations to capture governments and public health priorities. It is global in scope and
-------------------------	--

	<p>could be of interest to a wide range of stakeholders in the healthcare and public sectors.</p> <p>However, I think the paper could be strengthened in a number of ways. My major comment would be to introduce a framework through which readers could better understand the potential “levers” that government, academia, and other institutions have at their disposal when trying to limit corporate influence. Currently much of the text states that such “mechanisms” were identified, but these mechanisms are not described in detail in the text, nor are they put into a coherent framework that allows the reader to come away with a deeper understanding of how to move forward. These levers could include things like grouping mechanisms into domains that a) enhance transparency, b) introduce administrative processes that limit corporate influence, c) prohibit funding or involvement in research and guideline development, etc etc etc.</p> <p>Much of this detail is buried in the Tables, but I think the manuscript would be strengthened if the authors described their findings more clearly in the text. The academia, media, civil society results section, for example, provides little information beyond the number of mechanisms identified and that some institutions use conflicts of interest and transparency-promoting policies to minimize corporate influence — which most readers probably are aware of before reading this manuscript.</p> <p>Again, the Tables have a great deal of interesting and important information, but I think some of this needs to be presented in the text itself.</p> <p>Another suggestion is to introduce some assessment of how successful such mechanisms are. I understand that this review is meant to give readers a sense of the issue and what options are available, but it would be helpful to understand if such mechanisms have been successful, and if so, which ones have been particularly effective.</p>
--	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Florian Fischer Bielefeld University, Germany
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	30-Dec-2019

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This is a very interesting and carefully prepared manuscript, presenting results of a scoping review. I do have one major concern: Although it was not the primary aim of this study, the readers may ask about the effects of different mechanisms. Is it possible to state on the effects, at least a bit in the discussion section?</p> <p>Further suggestion are only minor comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Line 65: This is a very provocative statement — although it is correct. However, I suggest to delete it, because it is not necessary.</li> <li>• Line 126: Letters to the editor are usually not peer-reviewed publications.</li> <li>• Lines 1246f.: Where is the novelty of this study’s results? You need to emphasize what your review adds to the already existing ones.</li> <li>• Line 150: The name of the librarian does not need to be added. You can add his name in the acknowledgement section.</li> </ul>
-------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lines 167-172: I suggest to name the databases at line 149, before you mention the search algorithm.</li> <li>• Line 177: From which year on have studies been included. Here it seems as if it is after 2003 (meaning beginning in 2004), whereas in line 166 the timespan 2003-2019 is mentioned.</li> <li>• Line 189: What about interrater consistency?</li> <li>• Line 190: How many articles have been unavailable?</li> <li>• Lines 208 and 232: What about the employment status of authors at industry? Do you mean the state of employment when the manuscript has been published or ever before?</li> <li>• Line 225: This is unclear: Do you mean the authors of this study or of the primary studies?</li> <li>• Line 289: I suggest to rephrase it according to the headline: "...corporations on governments and international organisations."</li> <li>• Lines 355-372: This may belong to the limitations section. I suggest to add the discussion about contents first, and place the limitations at the end.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Bey-Marrie Schmidt South African Medical Research Council, South Africa.
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	17-Feb-2020

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p><b>ABSTRACT</b></p> <p>Design: How was screening and data extraction done? By whom? How was data analysis done? Did you do a systematic search? Did you develop a search strategy?</p> <p>Setting: Either remove or write a full sentence about the setting.</p> <p>Results: How many records did your search yield in total? Were the number of records different by settings? The conclusion is missing as well as implication for practice or research of the scoping review findings.</p> <p><b>MAIN TEXT</b></p> <p>References should be before the punctuation. Some minor grammar issues throughout the text. Can the authors please better explain these reasons for conducting a scoping review? "A scoping review was deemed to be the most relevant method for this study as we intended to summarise evidence from a heterogeneous body of research.(40) A scoping review advances knowledge in an emerging field of research.(40)"</p> <p>From a presentation perspective, it might be better if the authors moved the search terms/strategy out of the main text and into an appendix.</p> <p>It is fine for the eligibility criteria to be written as bullet points, but that should not compromise the details. For e.g. why were only English, French, Spanish, Portuguese or Italian studies chosen? This is important to justify in terms of available resource for the review team and/or the geographic limitation.</p> <p>The authors refer to the search records as yielding materials. Where these published and unpublished documents or other types of materials?</p> <p>What were the backward and forward searches for? To identify new documents or as a quality check?</p> <p>The two categories of mechanisms chosen for synthesising the evidence are fine, but why were they chosen?</p> <p>The results and discussion section are complete.</p>
-------------------------	--

# VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer comment	Authors' response	Changes made to text
<p>Reviewer 1: Thank you for asking me to review this paper which draws on systematic literature searches to develop 'an inventory of the mechanisms to address and manage the influence of corporations on public health policy, research and practice'. This is done across a very wide range of industries – alcohol, food, gambling, oil, pharma and tobacco – at a variety of spatial/ political scales. The result is a comprehensive list of mechanisms that exist, but may or may not have been implemented with (unknown) degrees of success. The paper delivers on what it sets out to do and provides a well-referenced and methodologically sound repository of information on these mechanisms for other researchers in the field. To this end, however, it is mostly descriptive. It does acknowledge the need for 'more research on these mechanisms' and 'an evaluation of these mechanisms', but stops short of doing so. While it is correct to claim originality for being the first paper to provide an overview of these mechanisms, I think there are some aspects of the paper that could do with further reflection and analysis.</p>		
<p>1. The paper explores mechanisms across six huge and diverse industries with which the public and politicians have very different relationships and whose health impacts are diverse. Pharma is definitively not the same in a public health sense as food/ alcohol/ tobacco and all raise fundamentally different questions to that of oil. While there are clear synergies in terms of corporate actors and strategies across them, to roll them into one category misses the nuance of public concern and public risk. It also fundamentally erases both the political and the social. The paper needed to better reflect on these differences, rather than just admit that its scope was broad. Breadth at the expense of explanatory or analytical depth is not always that enlightening.</p>	<p>Thank you. We agree with your comment that these are very different industries.</p> <p>However, the focus of our analysis was not on these industries per se, but rather on their political practices, which are similar across industries, and, in particular, ways to address these practices. We have discussed these political practices in our background section and their many commonalities, and we now develop in more detail the case for looking at them collectively.</p> <p>We started this exercise with the food industry in mind, but we soon realised that the mechanisms to address that political influence were also applicable to other industries, thus expanding the scope of our analysis.</p> <p>We already noted that some mechanisms could be applied to specific industries, in our tables for example, and we suggest, in some instances, that a risk-benefits analysis be conducted, as</p>	<p>Page 3, lines 71-3 we have now added "These corporate practices that have a negative impact on health, and that are used across industries, are increasingly referred to as 'commercial determinants of health' in the literature."</p>

		<p>these are indeed different industries and companies.</p> <p>We have now referred to the broader, emerging literature on the commercial determinants of health to better explain why we focused on mechanisms for all these industries.</p> <p>We believe that comparing these mechanisms across industries is enlightening, as we identified similarities in managing their influence on public health.</p>	
2.	<p>What does it mean to have a mechanism simply exist without any sense of its path to (non)implementation? One of the great barriers to better health worldwide is not a lack of regulation, but its equitable enforcement. How might paths and experiences of implementation be researched? That's probably the bigger and more important question. Setting out mechanisms is hypothetical. The paper needed more reflection on the reality of what these mechanisms can or cannot achieve and why? Why might a mechanism work in one type of industry but not another? What does that tell us about the political/scientific/ public relation with that industry and its products? What does it tell us about the place of implementation? Again, more nuance, reflection and critical engagement with the varied contexts of these mechanisms would make for a more analytical paper.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The mechanisms we describe could be seen as lying on one axis in a 2 dimensional matrix, where the other is populated by jurisdictions (organizational, then individual national, sub-national, or groupings thereof). The mechanisms we identified are related to the industries, or, in many cases, the common tactics they use. However, the implementation of such mechanisms is determined by characteristics of the countries, etc. Thus, what can be implemented is a function of factors that include the quality of governance, trust in institutions, culture, and the rule of law. We believe that this goes well beyond the scope of this review.</p> <p>We made some changes to the text, in our discussion, to better reflect this limitation.</p>	<p>In our discussion, we have now included a comment for future research, page 17, lines 413-5: "There is a need to understand if these mechanisms are effective in addressing the influence of all industries, or of only some industries, and then study the political, social and other factors responsible for these differences."</p>

Reviewer 2: Thank you for the opportunity to review your paper. The article is interesting and has the potential to make a valuable contribution. Despite its apparent strengths, there are a few areas that could have been done with more clarity. Below I offer some suggestions to further strengthen the paper.

1.	<p>Introduction</p> <p>- A topic sentence at the beginning of each paragraph would help improve the flow of the paragraphs in the Introduction.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We believe we have already started each paragraph with an introductory sentence:</p> <p>Paragraph 1: "There is growing evidence, coupled with public awareness, that the economic power of corporations, particularly that of large transnationals, has led to the defeat, delay, and weakening of public health policies around the world."</p> <p>Paragraph 2: "Industry efforts to influence public policy, research and practice are often referred to as 'corporate political activity' (CPA)."</p> <p>Paragraph 3: "Several institutions have been established to monitor the influence of corporations on public health policy, research and practice."</p> <p>Paragraph 4: "National health authorities and civil society organisations have increasingly been concerned with the weakening, delay and obstruction of public health policies due to harmful corporate practices."</p> <p>Paragraph 5: "The demand for mechanisms to protect the policy process from undue corporate influence is growing."</p> <p>Paragraph 6: "Identification and monitoring of the industry influence on public health policy, research and</p>	<p>No changes made to the text.</p>
----	---	---	-------------------------------------

		practice is a necessary but insufficient step in protecting and promoting public health.”	
2.	- You did a great job of describing increasing industry efforts to influence public policy, research and practice. It would be great to provide a brief description of ‘Corporate Permeation Index’ (Lines 80-81). 1-2 sentences would be fine.	Thanks again. We have now provided additional details about that tool.	Page 4, lines 87-9, two sentences were added to that paragraph: “This index seeks to quantify the penetration of corporations in a given country, and was recently implemented for 148 countries over the period 2010-5. The results showed extensive international variation.”
3.	Discussion:  - Page 14 Lines 343-344: Not sure what you mean here, could you elaborate on this sentence?	Thank you, we have now changed that sentence. Your comment made us realise that perhaps “adopted” better reflected the status of the examples we found for each mechanisms (i.e.; these mechanisms have been “adopted” in countries, but not necessarily implemented).	Page 15, lines 363-5 now reads “Based on publically available information, we found that 43 of these mechanisms had been adopted, although we could not confirm that they had all been implemented and had been determined to be effective.”
4.	- Page 15 Lines 347-348: I guess you mean that the majority of these 26 mechanisms targets academia. It would be better to rearrange the grouping of the mechanisms displayed in Table 2 to demonstrate this. It seems confusing in its current format.	We have now changed the wording for some of these categories from Table 2 to better reflect our findings.	Table 2, the categories now read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universities and other research institutions</li> <li>• Research funding committees, panels or boards</li> <li>• Ethics review boards</li> <li>• Academic journals</li> <li>• Professional associations and civil society organisations</li> <li>• Conferences and other meetings in public health</li> <li>• Media</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>
5.	Minor edits:  - Should it be ‘Additional’ or ‘Supplementary’ files? At least, it should be consistent throughout.	Thank you for pointing this out. We have now renamed all relevant files ‘Supplementary Files’.	Various changes to the Supplementary Files.

6.	- Page 16 Line 385: FCTC, not FTCT	N/A	Change made, as suggested, on page 17.
7.	- Please include research recommendations in the Abstract section	Thank you, we have now included a conclusions section in our abstract.	We have now added a new section in our abstract: "Conclusions: We identified several mechanisms that could help address and/or manage the negative influence of corporations on public health policy, research and practice. If adopted and evaluated more widely, many of the mechanisms described in this manuscript could contribute to efforts to prevent and control non communicable diseases."
<p>Reviewer 3: The goal of this study was to identify ways in which institutions can reduce the influence of corporations on public health policy in order to minimize ethical lapses and conflicts of interest. The authors searched several large databases and drew on their collective experience to identify 49 total mechanisms, 41 of which have been implemented in some capacity. This review tackles an important issue: the growing influence of corporations to capture governments and public health priorities. It is global in scope and could be of interest to a wide range of stakeholders in the healthcare and public sectors.</p>			
1.	However, I think the paper could be strengthened in a number of ways. My major comment would be to introduce a framework through which readers could better understand the potential "levers" that government, academia, and other institutions have at their disposal when trying to limit corporate influence. Currently much of the text states that such "mechanisms" were identified, but these mechanisms are not described in detail in the text, nor are they put into a coherent framework that allows the reader to come away with a deeper understanding of how to move forward. These levers could include things like grouping mechanisms into domains that a) enhance	Thank you, this is a very important comment, that we have now tried to address in the manuscript, with a description of the different types of mechanisms that we found in the literature and additional information in our Tables accordingly to these different types.	<p>We have added new details in our methods section, under 'synthesis of results', page 10, we added: "We identified, four broad types of mechanisms for addressing and managing the influence of corporations on public health policy, research and practice, through our interpretation of the data, and as presented at the beginning of our results section. Most mechanisms identified in this review pertain to one or more of these four broad types."</p> <p>In addition, we have added a new paragraph, pages 12-3, modified Tables 1 and 2: "Many of the mechanisms identified in our review, as discussed in the sections below, focus on the management of COI. COI</p>

	<p>transparency, b) introduce administrative processes that limit corporate influence, c) prohibit funding or involvement in research and guideline development, etc etc.</p>		<p>provisions might not be sufficient to reduce industry influence and that interactions with industry can be ethically problematic and may influence public health policy, research and practice even when COI policies are not implemented (43,44). We identified four main types of mechanisms to address undue influence from corporations (categories are not mutually exclusive): i) managing the interactions with industry and COI; ii) increasing transparency about these interactions and COI; iii) identifying, monitoring and educating third parties in academia, civil society, and the media about the practices of corporations and associated risks; iv) prohibiting any interaction with industry. There are other types of mechanisms, such as the protection of whistle-blowers, or mandatory taxes for companies to be used by an independent organisation to fund public health research and practice, as detailed below.”</p>
2.	<p>Much of this detail is buried in the Tables, but I think the manuscript would be strengthened if the authors described their findings more clearly in the text. The academia, media, civil society results section, for example, provides little information beyond the number of mechanisms identified and that some institutions use conflicts of interest and transparency-promoting policies to minimize corporate influence — which most</p>	<p>We hope that the response provided to your first comment also addresses this second comment, as we now describe the different types of mechanisms we identified.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>

	readers probably are aware of before reading this manuscript. Again, the Tables have a great deal of interesting and important information, but I think some of this needs to be presented in the text itself.		
3.	Another suggestion is to introduce some assessment of how successful such mechanisms are. I understand that this review is meant to give readers a sense of the issue and what options are available, but it would be helpful to understand if such mechanisms have been successful, and if so, which ones have been particularly effective.	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have responded to a similar comment from reviewer 1 “The mechanisms we describe could be seen as lying on one axis in a 2 dimensional matrix, where the other is populated by jurisdictions (organizational, then individual national, sub-national, or groupings thereof). The mechanisms we identified are related to the industries, or, in many cases, the common tactics they use. However, the implementation of such mechanisms is determined by characteristics of the countries, etc. Thus, what can be implemented is a function of factors that include the quality of governance, trust in institutions, culture, and the rule of law. We believe that this goes well beyond the scope of this review.</p> <p>We made some changes to the text, in our discussion, to better reflect this limitation.”</p>	<p>See response 2 to reviewer 1.</p> <p>“In our discussion, we have now included a comment for future research, page 17, lines 413-5: “There is a need to understand if these mechanisms are effective in addressing the influence of all industries, or of only some industries, and then study the political, social and other factors responsible for these differences.””</p>
Reviewer 4: This is a very interesting and carefully prepared manuscript, presenting results of a scoping review.			
1.	I do have one major concern: Although it was not the primary aim of this study, the readers may ask about the effects of different mechanisms. Is it possible to	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have responded to a similar comment from reviewer 1 – “The mechanisms we describe could be seen as lying on one axis in a 2 dimensional matrix, where the other is</p>	<p>See response 2 to reviewer 1.</p> <p>“In our discussion, we have now included a comment for future research, page 17, lines 413-5: “There is a need to understand if these</p>

	state on the effects, at least a bit in the discussion section?	<p>populated by jurisdictions (organizational, then individual national, sub-national, or groupings thereof). The mechanisms we identified are related to the industries, or, in many cases, the common tactics they use. However, the implementation of such mechanisms is determined by characteristics of the countries, etc. Thus, what can be implemented is a function of factors that include the quality of governance, trust in institutions, culture, and the rule of law. We believe that this goes well beyond the scope of this review.</p> <p>We made some changes to the text, in our discussion, to better reflect this limitation”</p>	mechanisms are effective in addressing the influence of all industries, or of only some industries, and then study the political, social and other factors responsible for these differences.””
2.	<p>Further suggestion are only minor comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line 65: This is a very provocative statement – although it is correct. However, I suggest to delete it, because it is not necessary.</li> </ul>	We would like to keep this statement in our manuscript because there is ample evidence for it and it helps identify the problem with concrete details.	No changes made to the text.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line 126: Letters to the editor are usually not peer-reviewed publications.</li> </ul>	Thank you for pointing this out. We have changed that sentence now.	First sentence of the methods section now reads: “We conducted a scoping review, where we searched scientific publications (peer-reviewed articles, letters to the editor, commentaries, etc.) and reports from governments, international organisations and civil society.”
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lines 124: Where is the novelty of this study’s results? You need to emphasize what your review</li> </ul>	We have noted the novelty of our study in the discussion section, after having presented our results. See for example the last	No changes made to the text.

	adds to the already existing ones.	paragraph on page 15: "To our knowledge, this review is the first attempt to develop an inventory of mechanisms to address and manage the influence of corporations on public health policy, research and practice."	
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line 150: The name of the librarian does not need to be added. You can add his name in the acknowledgement section.</li> </ul>	Thank you for your suggestion. We have now moved these details to an acknowledgement section.	The name of the librarian has been moved to a separate acknowledgement section in the title page.
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lines 167-172: I suggest to name the databases at line 149, before you mention the search algorithm.</li> </ul>	Thanks again for this suggestion. We have moved the list of databases before the search strategy.	Page 7: in the methods section, the list of databases before the search strategy.
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line 177: From which year on have studies been included. Here it seems as if it is after 2003 (meaning beginning in 2004), whereas in line 166 the timespan 2003-2019 is mentioned.</li> </ul>	Thanks for this important comment. We have included data from 2003 (not after). This has been clarified in our manuscript.	Page 8, the first inclusion criteria is now: "Be published in 2003 and later, when the WHO-FCTC came into effect"
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line 189: What about interrater consistency?</li> </ul>	We did not measure the inter-rater consistency but rather selected articles after reviewers reached consensus.	Page 9, line 202, we have now added: "Disagreement was resolved by consensus after discussion between MM and GS."
9.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line 190: How many articles have been unavailable?</li> </ul>	We have now provided that information in our manuscript.	Page 9, lines 199-201, sentence now reads: "When publications were not available online, MM contacted the first authors of the materials to obtain a copy of the documents (n=13)."
10.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lines 208 and 232: What about the employment status of authors at industry? Do you mean the state of employment when the manuscript has been published or ever before?</li> </ul>	Thank you for your question, as noted in our manuscript, we check the status of employment as disclosed in the documents identified through our searches. That usually includes information for when the manuscripts are published.	No changes made to the text.

11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line 225: This is unclear: Do you mean the authors of this study or of the primary studies?</li> </ul>	We meant ourselves and have clarified that in the text.	Page 10, line 240, we have removed "the authors" and rather used "ourselves".
12.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Line 289: I suggest to rephrase it according to the headline: "...corporations on governments and international organisations."</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment. We have made the necessary changes to the text.	Page 13, lines 315-6, the sentence now reads "In our scoping review, we identified 23 mechanisms for addressing and/or managing the influence of corporations on governments and international organisations."
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lines 355-372: This may belong to the limitations section. I suggest to add the discussion about contents first, and place the limitations at the end.</li> </ul>	We have structured our discussion as follow: content is discussed first, then we have the limitations of our specific study, then broader impact on policy, and we finish with gaps in research. We believe the structure of our discussion flows well and would therefore like to keep it as it is.	No changes made to the text.
Reviewer 5			
1.	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>Design:</p> <p>How was screening and data extraction done? By whom?</p>	Thank you for your comment. Given the word limit for the abstract section, we have only provided that information in our methods section.	No changes made to the text.
2.	How was data analysis done?	See our comment above.	No changes made to the text.
3.	Did you do a systematic search? Did you develop a search strategy?	We have explained that we conducted a scoping review, which involves searches of a systematic nature. We did not provide details about our search strategy in the abstract due to limited space.	No changes made to the text.
4.	<p>Setting:</p> <p>Either remove or write a full sentence about the setting.</p>	Thank you for your comment. We have now removed that section.	The 'setting' section of the abstract has been removed.

5.	Results:  How many records did your search yield in total?	We did not provide additional details in the abstract due to limited space.	No changes made to the text.
6.	Were the number of records different by settings?	We have included these details in our results section in the manuscript only, due to limited space in the abstract section.	No changes made to the text.
7.	The conclusion is missing as well as implication for practice or research of the scoping review findings.	We have now included a section on conclusions in the abstract.	See our response to reviewer 2, comment 7.  “We have now added a new section in our abstract: “Conclusions: We identified several mechanisms that could help address and/or manage the negative influence of corporations on public health policy, research and practice. If adopted and evaluated more widely, many of the mechanisms described in this manuscript could contribute to efforts to prevent and control non communicable diseases.””
8.	MAIN TEXT  References should be before the punctuation.	Thank you for your suggestion.	Various changes made through the text.
9.	Some minor grammar issues throughout the text.	We have carefully re-read the manuscript to ensure that no grammar issues are left in the text.	Changes made through the text.
10.	Can the authors please better explain these reasons for conducting a scoping review? “A scoping review was deemed to be the most relevant method for this study as we intended to summarise evidence from a heterogeneous body of research.(40) A scoping review advances knowledge in an emerging field of research.(40)”	Thank you for this comment. We have now provided additional details on the reasons why we conducted a scoping review.	Page 6, lines 136-8 now reads: “A scoping review was deemed to be the most relevant method for this study as we intended to summarise evidence from a heterogeneous body of research, from academia, governments, civil society organisations and other actors in public health (40). A scoping review also advances knowledge in an emerging field of research,

			which is the case for mechanisms to address the influence of corporations on public health (40). In addition, it helps examine the nature of available research and research gaps in the literature, which could inform future research (40).”
11.	From a presentation perspective, it might be better if the authors moved the search terms/strategy out of the main text and into an appendix.	The reporting items in PRISMA for a scoping review include at least the presentation of one search strategy. We have therefore kept that text in the manuscript.	No changes made to the text.
12.	It is fine for the eligibility criteria to be written as bullet points, but that should not compromise the details. For e.g. why were only English, French, Spanish, Portuguese or Italian studies chosen? This is important to justify in terms of available resource for the review team and/or the geographic limitation.	Thank you for your comment. We have now added further details about the justification for including these languages only.	Page 8, we have added “languages for which members of our team had at least working proficiency.”
13.	The authors refer to the search records as yielding materials. Where these published and unpublished documents or other types of materials?	We are not sure what section of the text this comment is referring to. We have specified the type of documents that were included in our analysis in the methods section of our manuscript.	No changes made to the text.
14.	What were the backward and forward searches for? To identify new documents or as a quality check?	Thank you for comment – this information was indeed not clear enough. We have provided further details to clarify the purpose of our searches.	Page 9, lines 204-5, we have added “to identify additional relevant material.”
15.	The two categories of mechanisms chosen for synthesising the evidence are fine, but why were they chosen?	Thank you for this important comment. We have now clarified the reason why we had these different actors to present our results in our analysis.	Page 10, lines 235-7, we have now added additional information to explain why we’ve presented our results this way: “We decided to first present data for individuals and institutions in

			governments as they may have a legal obligation to address undue influence from corporations and conflicts of interest, while this might not be the case for other actors in public health."
16.	The results and discussion section are complete.	N/A	N/A

Please note that other minor amendments have been made to the text to improve readability and clarity. All changes that have been made to the manuscript have been highlighted in red in the revised manuscript.

## VERSION 2 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Clare Herrick King's College London, UK
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	25-Mar-2020

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	The authors have responded in a clear and comprehensive way to the five reviews and I am satisfied that the paper is now suitable for publication in its present form.
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Ratchakorn Kaewpramkusol Ministry of Public Health, Thailand
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	05-Apr-2020

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	Thank you for taking on board all reviewers' comments.
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dhruv Khullar Weill Cornell Medicine
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	25-Mar-2020

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This is a well-written paper on the influence of corporations on public policy and the revision represents an improvement. In particular, the authors have added a section that describes the main mechanisms through which corporations influence public policy, which improves the readability of the paper by offering a coherent framework for their findings.</p> <p>They also note that they were not able to assess the effectiveness of many interventions to reduce undue influence, which is appropriate given data limitations. I still think more of the information provided in the Table could be incorporated into the text, but recognize that there are space limitations. Overall, the manuscript is improved and is an important contribution to the existing literature.</p>
-------------------------	---

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Florian Fischer Ravensburg-Weingarten University of Applied Sciences
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	06-Mar-2020
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	The authors have adressed almost all comments or provided some reasons for not doing so. I am absolutely fine with the current version of the manuscript.